



Public Document Pack

Arun District Council
Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN17 5LF

Tel: (01903 737500)
Fax: (01903) 730442
DX: 57406 Littlehampton
Minicom: 01903 732765

e-mail: committees@arun.gov.uk

Committee Manager - Carley Lavender (01903 737547)

29 August 2024

SPECIAL ECONOMY COMMITTEE

A special meeting of the Economy Committee will be held in **The Council Chamber and Blue Room, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF** on **Thursday 12 September 2024 at 6.00 pm** and you are requested to attend.

Members: Councillors Nash (Chair), Woodman (Vice-Chair), Cooper, Edwards, Gunner, Lawrence, Northeast, Oppler, Pendleton, Penycate and Stanley.

PLEASE NOTE:

A live webcast of the meeting will be available via the Council's [Web Pages](#)

Any members of the public wishing to address the Committee meeting during Public Question Time, will need to email Committees@arun.gov.uk by 5.15 pm on **Thursday, 5 September 2024** in line with current Committee Meeting Procedure Rules.

For further information on the items to be discussed, please contact Committees@arun.gov.uk

AGENDA

1. APOLOGIES

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members and Officers are invited to make any declaration of pecuniary, personal and/or prejudicial interests that they may have in relation to items on this agenda, and are reminded that they should re-declare their interest before consideration of the items or as soon as the interest becomes apparent.

Members and Officers should make their declaration by stating:

- a) the item they have the interest in
- b) whether it is a pecuniary/personal interest and/or prejudicial interest
- c) the nature of the interest

3. MINUTES (Pages 1 - 14)

The Committee will be asked to approve as a correct record the Minutes of the Economy Committee held on 8 July 2024.

4. ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA THAT THE CHAIR OF THE MEETING IS OF THE OPINION SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AS A MATTER OF URGENCY BY REASON OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

5. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

To receive questions from the public (for a period of up to 15 minutes)

6. COASTAL CATALYST, PLACE PARTNERSHIP FUND BID (Pages 15 - 20)

The report advises members of the Coastal Catalyst Place Partnership Fund awarded project and seeks Committee's support for the inclusion of the Arun District in the scheme.

7. BEACH HUT LEASE TERMS - BEACH ACCESS CONSIDERATIONS (Pages 21 - 30)

This report follows from the Beach Hut Lease Terms report which was presented to Economy Committee on 8 July, and responds to questions raised by members regarding beach access solutions and the allocation of beach hut income towards such a scheme.

The report also explores options for lease mechanisms to permit subletting or sharing of occupation and responds to proposals for further rent increases to non-resident leaseholders.

OUTSIDE BODIES - FEEDBACK FROM MEETINGS

No outside body updates have been notified or received.

8. WORK PROGRAMME (Pages 35 - 36)

Members are required to note the work programme for the remainder of 2024 -2025.

Note : If Members have any detailed questions, they are reminded that they need to inform the Chair and relevant Director in advance of the meeting.

Note : Filming, Photography and Recording at Council Meetings – The District Council supports the principles of openness and transparency in its decision making and permits filming, recording and the taking of photographs at its meetings that are open to the public. This meeting may therefore be recorded, filmed or broadcast by video or audio, by third parties. Arrangements for these activities should operate in accordance with guidelines agreed by the Council and as available via the following link [Filming Policy](#)

This page is intentionally left blank

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 3

Subject to approval at the next Economy Committee meeting

47

ECONOMY COMMITTEE

8 July 2024 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Nash (Chair), Woodman (Vice-Chair), Mrs Cooper (Substitute for Edwards), Cooper, Gunner, Lawrence, Northeast, Oppler (Substitute for Needs), Penycate and Lury (Substitute for Stanley)

Councillors Goodheart and Pendleton were also in attendance for all or part of the meeting.

74. APOLOGIES

There were apologies received from Councillors Edwards, Needs and Stanley.

75. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made.

76. MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 16 April were approved by the Committee and signed by the Chair.

77. ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA THAT THE CHAIRMAN OF THE MEETING IS OF THE OPINION SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AS A MATTER OF URGENCY BY REASON OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

There were no urgent items presented at the meeting.

78. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no Public Questions received for the meeting.

79. COMMITTEE MEETING START TIMES

The Chair proposed that the committee meeting start time remain at 6pm for the remainder of the municipal year, this was duly seconded by the Vice-Chair.

Economy Committee - 8.07.24

The Committee

RESOLVED

That meeting start times remain at 6pm for 2024-25.

80. COUNCIL VISION PERFORMANCE REPORT 2023 - 2024

The Interim CEO and Director of Growth presented the report to members.

Members then noted the report.

81. KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR QUARTER 4 REPORT

The Interim CEO and Director of Growth presented the report to members.

During a short debate it was queried if the reason Boots had left Littlehampton High Street was known where it was advised it was not, however, it was known that the business had undertaken a review of the number of businesses across the country. It was also asked if since the regeneration work had been completed in the town had the council been actively marketing the empty units in the High Street. It was confirmed that specific marketing for individual properties had not been completed. However, members would be aware of the work undertaken by the Town Task Force that was run by Littlehampton Town Council and that Arun District Council contributed to. It was highlighted that there was difficulty experienced due to the number of different Landlords involved across the properties. However, discussions were ongoing with many options available for consideration.

Members then noted the report

82. CORPORATE GAS SUPPLY CONTRACT 2025-2029

The Property & Estates Facilities Manager presented the report to members and confirmed that Lazer energy had been appointment through the procurement process.

The recommendations were proposed by Councillor Woodman and seconded by Councillor Northeast.

Members requested clarity on the purpose of the recommendations before them where it was stated that in order for the Council to achieve the best purchasing price it needed to enter into an agreement and the process that was being followed was fully compliant. A query on timing stated in paragraph 6.2 of the report was raised, it was confirmed that a decision was required now to ensure that the council could obtain a best value contract. Finally, it was queried if the rate secured would be a variable or fixed rate, it was confirmed that variable was to be sought.

The Committee

RESOLVED that

2.1 Delegated authority be given to the Group Head of Technical Services to enter into a new four-year corporate gas supply contract commencing 1 April 2025, and.

2.2 Authorised the Group Head of Technical Services to sign the contract using DocuSign rather than executing as a Deed.

83. BEACH HUT LEASE TERMS

The Property Estates & Facilities Manager presented the report to members. He explained that the report provided members with a summary of the current position relating to rental beach huts, the leases expire on 31 March 2025. In considering all options included with the report was a detailed market appraisal, detail on appropriate rent setting and it outlines various courses of action including day hire, which was not recommended. The report recommends that the council offers to grant 92 existing and 13 additional beach huts for lease for a period of 3 years and that rents be initially uplifted by 15% and then reviewed annually in accordance with RPI.

The recommendations were proposed by Councillor Nash and seconded by Councillor Woodman

The Chair invited members to discuss the report and ask questions, Councillor Northeast was the first member invited to speak he stated that he was happy with the report and the accessible beach huts that were being implemented, however, he hoped for more and further work to be considered to ensure the beach was truly accessible for all, he also highlighted that there was a long waiting list for people wanting the beach huts which showed demand, due to this he proposed that the rents should be increased to 20% and the additional funds received from this increase be used to make the Beach more accessible to compliment the accessible beach huts. This was then seconded by Councillor Lawrence

The Chair then invited members to discuss the amendment that had been duly proposed and seconded where the following points were raised during the debate. It was asked if the waiting list for those waiting for beach huts had been reviewed since the cost-of-living crisis and did the council know how many of those on the list, were in fact still waiting it was felt that the suggested increase in the report and now the proposal increase could further impact those waiting to change their mind. There was also a query in relation to the lessees being able to lease out the beach hut themselves and was this still to be offered by the council. A suggestion was then made by another member that should lessees be able to lease out the beach huts themselves, there should be a space on the council's website that details this information so it can be known which beach huts are impacted, it was also suggested that any revenue made from this activity, the council should take a percentage of that fee.

Economy Committee - 8.07.24

The Chair reminded members to stick to discussing the amendment put forward by Councillor Northeast.

The location of the accessible beach huts was queried, it was confirmed that there were 2 locations for the accessible beach huts. On this basis it was then highlighted that the proposal to improve the accessibility of the beach, whilst well intentioned, would require that 2 separate locations would require improvement, immediately increasing the cost and therefore had there been any costings completed on how much the proposed additional 5% would bring in, how much would it cost to implement the improvements in the 2 locations to make the beach accessible and how long would it take for the funds to be raised with this suggested increase. It was confirmed that the 3 accessible beach huts that were due to be installed imminently, did include decking from the promenade to the beach huts and the costings for this had already been outlined and budgeted for in a previous report that had been considered by the committee. In response to the officer's clarification, it was confirmed that the suggested proposal by Councillor Northeast was asking the council to use the additional funds received from the proposed increase to implement accessibility options that would allow those to get from the beach huts down on to the sand. In response the Vice-Chair commented that she was unsure if implementing another boardwalk or a concrete run down to the sand would be the right way to go. She had seen other options available such as wheelchairs with larger wheels that could be pushed over the shingle, and that these may be the better option to be considered. It was then highlighted that the council's Beach Access Working Party had looked at these options and further officer advised was sought as the concern was that the proposal would not be deliverable.

The Interim CEO and Director of Growth laid out the practicalities of the additional 5% increase on the costings laid out in the report. The proposal only suggests this increase for 2024/25, the proposal did not include the additional increase by RPI for additional years. Should you agree the proposal you would be looking a relatively modest sum of funds, it would contribute, but it wouldn't be able to cover the whole costs of improvements to beach access being considered by the Working Party. He also highlighted that the Working Party were focused solely on the access to Bognor Regis beach and not Littlehampton which is the location of the beach huts you are reviewing today.

The Chair then advised members that he estimated with the proposed increase the council would be looking at approximately £700 - £1000. The proposer Councillor Northeast then commented that the council had 241 beach huts, he believed if an average of the Arun resident beach huts at £1,196, the proposal would see an increase of £60 for the 241 beach huts, which would equate to £14,000 in total to be ringfenced for these improvements. He then went on to explained that he had reviewed heavy duty ramps that could be rolled out and are successfully used elsewhere. He also confirmed that his intention was that the proposed increase would continue over future years with these funds all being ringfenced for beach accessibility improvement work.

It was then suggested that a larger increase be considered for those beach huts that were allocated for use by non-Arun residents, these were valuable assets to the council and there was opportunity to receive more money to be ringfenced for the beach improvements discussed. It was also asked if the question first asked regarding the total number of people on the waiting list be answered.

It was confirmed by Officers that within the last 3 years an exercise was completed for all those on the waiting list to confirm their interest. It was then commented that in 3 years the costs had now doubled and those on the waiting list would have confirmed their interest based on the information and costings at the time. It was then highlighted that the council only had 92 beach huts available to be included in this proposed increase, which made the funds potentially available to be around £7000, not the original figures stated.

The Chair with the permission of committee members then invited two non-committee members to address the committee. Comments made by these members were supportive of the proposed amendment, but they also had concerns regarding the costings and that further officer research was required before the committee made a decision.

The Interim CEO and Director of Growth then explained that unfortunately as officers had not been informed ahead of the meeting of this proposal, they were unable to provide detailed answers to the financial questions raised. He reminded the committee that the Beach Access Working Party had been formed to fully investigate accessible beach access options for Bognor Regis and members should be mindful that work that may be agreed and rolled out in Bognor could potentially be very different to that of Littlehampton. He suggested that if members wanted to move forward with this proposal, that they keep it simple in order to not restrict themselves moving forward.

Moving to concluding the debate it was raised that not knowing the capital costs was a complication, it was thought that the option of a 'roll out ramp' was unviable due to the gradient of the shingle. It was proposed by Councillor Gunner that a deferral on making a decision on this to allow for officers to go away and obtain the answers to the financial and viability queries raised during the debate and bring back an updated report to the next Economy Committee meeting. This was then seconded by Councillor Northeast, and he confirmed that he withdrew his original proposal.

Officers then raised concerns in terms of the amount of time to complete this additional work, along with the requirement to get new leases out to over a 100 people which was required to be completed before 1 April 2025. Members queried why the leases could not be drawn up and left in a 'ready to go' state with the exception of the potential 20% increase figure.

The Interim CEO and Director of Growth advised members on the impact this would have on the workload for the team and made the suggestion that members consider separating out the recommendations or to consider agreeing the 20% increase at this meeting. Further discussion was then had on the timing of reports being brought to Committee and presented to members, where the suggestion of an additional

Economy Committee - 8.07.24

meeting of the committee was made to allow for the work requested by members to be undertaken and brought back to members ahead of the next scheduled meeting in October 2024.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the report be DEFERRED to allow officers to obtain the answers to the financial and viability queries raised during the debate and bring back an updated report to the next Economy Committee meeting

84. REGIS QUARTER (WORKING TITLE) FEASIBILITY STUDY & INCORPORATING THE FORMER BREWERS FAYRE SITE

The Interim CEO and Director of Growth presented the report to members, explaining back in April 2024 members consider a previous report of the former Brewers Fayre Site, members requested to know the plans for the site next door to this site and the report before members today was addressing this request. He then ran through the appendices accompanying the report outlining their purpose. He then went on to remind members that the proposition for the Brewers Fayre site was to knock down the building to recreate a functional multi use space with an additional facility above potentially in the form of a restaurant to make the best use of the views out to sea. In terms of the Regis Centre car park, the vision document sets out a development which meets the brief of providing leisure as well as food and drink, whilst ensuring the car parking provision is re-provided. Also linked to this there are proposals for additional retail units that would wrap around this development. He explained that the key question was what kind of enabling development may be necessary to allow for all of that work to be delivered. Members were clear previously that they did not want residential development to be the enabling development, so it had been suggested that the inclusion of holiday accommodation be included. Officers want to test the market to see if there would be demand for this type of development, there was also a requirement to secure a developer to come on board with the project with the council to get it off the ground. In summing up he then ran through and explained the recommendations before members.

The recommendations were proposed by Councillor Oppler and seconded by Councillor Lury.

The Chair invited members to debate where concern was raised regarding paragraphs 2.3b and 2.6b of which referred to consultation aspect of these proposals and when would the public be consulted, would it be at the Planning stage, part of the BID process. It was confirmed that public consultation would take place at many points throughout the project, should members be supportive of the recommendations before them then there would be public consultation on these plans very soon and certainly at the Planning stages.

It was commented by the Leader of the Council that the location for this project was a prime site in Bognor Regis and he believed that the council needed to be bold and ambitious. Plans had been being reviewed since 2002 so this had been an ambition that had been waiting a long time to come to fruition, he stated that the need to encourage more tourists to the area was vital for the economy, the current plans were exciting, in particular the idea of a raised viewing platform would be a great addition. He agreed with the previous comments made relating to public consultation and expressed his support for this to be undertaken to ensure that the public would be on board with the plans. He expressed that he wants the project to include biodiverse options such as solar panels and green roofs, to ensure climate change compliance. He echoed the need for other partners to come on board to ensure the project deliverability.

Concerns were raised by the Leader of the Opposition, whilst he stated that he welcomed the report and was broadly supportive of a lot of what had been presented throughout the report, he did however struggle with the height of the building, highlighted on pages, 117, 118, 119 and 120. He remained sceptical on having a 400-seater venue included, the additional financing required stating that the council had had a lot of offers in the past, however these had not been costed properly. He referred to the Coast to Capital report, highlighting that it referred to the Town Hall and he wanted to know where the council was with its plans for this building. Was there a possibility of its use being a part of this project also.

The Chair responded to these concerns stating that he understood the comments regarding the height of the build, however, he believed that these concerns could be overcome with a really good design that makes it an attractive landmark. He reconfirmed his position regarding the Theatre and the Royal Hall by saying that they had previously worked nicely alongside each other. He went on to state that the council needed to be considering options that allowed for more options to be considered regarding seating for the Theatre, inclusive of retractable seating.

Further support for the proposal was made clear, particularly the green credentials detailed, a suggestion was made that the Town Hall could be used in the form of an arts and crafts museum but be sure not to diminish the building in its current beauty.

The Interim CEO and Director of Growth was invited by the Chair to respond to the comments made where he confirmed that the Town Hall had been specifically excluded from these proposals. Due to the review of the future accommodation needs of the Council still being undertaken. However, if members direct officers to include the building within the plans this could be done, but he reminded members that as a listed building it was thought that it would work better if it was not included. He went on to highlight that the former Brewers Fayre sites was being looked at to provide a multi-use facility, that would see 365 days use where possible. Specifically addressing the height concerns made he referred members back to his earlier comments regarding the need for having an enabling development in order to ensure delivery of these plans.

The Project Officer was then invited to speak where he reconfirmed that the Brewers Fayre improvements would be complimentary to the improvements proposed

Economy Committee - 8.07.24

for the former Royal Hall. It would support corporate conferencing that would enable year-round use with the leisure users being situated on the ground floor, he went on to explained that the plans presented were the initial modelling to be used as a conversation starter. As the Town Hall is a listed building he explained that the council had tried to provide it, with its own setting, keeping it set back but giving its own enhancement, referring to the Arcade as another listed building, the aim was to provide and create an exciting architectural project.

It was asked if officers were able to provide a timeline of work, inclusive of public consultation and each phase of the development to give everyone insight into when things would start happening. The Interim CEO and Director of Growth stated that the approach to the project delivery had been separated into 2 phases, the Brewers Fayre site which would be taken forward under its own guise, however, whilst that was happening work can be undertaken to look for funding opportunities to enable the project to move forward should funding be secured. Phase 2 would then be delivered as single entity, results of the soft market testing would be required to be brought back to committee for members to make further decisions, he stressed that phase 2 was a long way away at this point in time. The Project Officer added that the options presented were comprehensive, activity at the sites was starting and that anything that comes forward in these next stages would have a lot more credibility to it. The aim was to bring heritage assets together and to provide a full landmark scheme, which would be a focal point of the seafront, the project was aspirational, and it should be.

Further support for the plans presented were heard, including comments stating that there were not easy solutions with a project like this, support for the former Royal Hall and the Theatre complimenting each other previously, when considering the multi-uses aspect for the building there should be no restrictions, or anything ruled out at this stage. Comments supporting the concerns for the proposed height of the building were also made with the caveat that it was clear there would need to be compromises made as a council and community. One member stated that his concerns in relation to the height of the build was its asymmetry and could an explanation be given for the reasoning behind this decision. It was asked how practical a 'living roof' would be and world solar panels not be a better option to consider, had these be investigated and costed fully. Finally, it was asked how confident were officers that a hotel could be delivered as presented.

The Project Officer confirmed that more modelling would be required as the council move forward with the project, currently the plans showed what could be delivered. The design was chosen to make the most of the sea views as well as being modelled against the height of the Premier Inn. He reminded members that the plans had taken into consideration all the options requested by members previously whilst providing multi-use options for maximum revenue opportunity and this was all reliant on the enabling development points that had been highlighted to them throughout the report. Finally, he confirmed that a high-level financial review had been undertaken which comprised of varying factors which showed different revenue values could be generated. Ultimately Hotel accommodation would be a very valuable asset to have which would see traffic generated from the multi-use options being considered such as corporate conferencing.

The Interim CEO and Director of Growth addressed the query regarding the asymmetry of the building design explaining that this had been suggested to create a transition within the middle of the development, however it would be something that officers would continue to review and would in part, be influenced by the viability.

Discussion then moved on to the car parking provision verses the numbers currently being expected to come and visit the Theatre and the former Royal Hall, it was felt that the provision was insufficient, it was requested to be understood if this had been reviewed and the parking capacity had been presented as is. The Chair confirmed that currently there were 130 parking spaces and with the development this would increase to 235 spaces. The Interim CEO and Director of Growth added that the number of spaces had been agreed as it was what worked with the current design, he also advised that there were other parking provisions within the Town that were not utilised as a 'first choice' and these sites could be reviewed with a view to enhance these other sites also. The Project Officer commented that the council were keen to push the available public transport options also.

The Chair, then proposed that an additional recommendation (f) be added to recommendations, and this read.

f. Soft market testing be carried out in relation to this proposal with some flexibility accepted in relation to its size

This amendment was then seconded by Councillor Lury and upon the vote being taken it was declared CARRIED.

Finally, the Chair with permission of the committee invited non-committee members to address the committee, after this the recommendations were put to the vote.

It was requested that a recorded vote be taken, those voting For were Councillors Cooper (Andy), Cooper (Alison), Lawrence, Lury, Nash, Northeast, Oppler, Penycate and Woodman (9), those voting Against (0) and those voting to Abstain were Councillor Gunner (1).

The Committee

RESOLVED

2.1 The Committee notes the content of the reports attached as appendices.

2.2 The Committee supports the principle of demolishing and redeveloping the former Brewers Fayre Public House as a multi-use venue with other uses intended to support the visitor economy, and to be likely cojoined to the (by then) refurbished and extended Alexandra Theatre building.

2.3 The Committee supports the following in furtherance of delivering 2.2 above.

- a. That the preference is for any new facility to be operated in conjunction with the updated Alexandra Theatre and a detailed business case be prepared on basis of this as the preferred option.
- b. That public consultation on the proposed project be undertaken to inform (c) below.
- c. That the details of a preferred scheme be developed to secure the completion of RIBA stage 3 (securing Planning Permission).
- d. That the cost of undertaking the work listed at (b) and (c) above, including the funding of a project officer be drawn from any funding allocated from the West Sussex Business Rate Pool to the Arun Growth Deal (subject to the agreement of West Sussex County Council as a co-signatory to the Arun Growth Deal).
- e. That the Committee delegate to the Director of Growth authority to draw down the funding identified above and commission any necessary external work necessary to deliver the above in accordance with the Councils rules on procurement.

2.4 That officers be asked to seek (and bid where necessary) for external funding to deliver the required capital funding for the project listed above.

2.5 The Committee supports the principle of redeveloping the Regis Centre Car Park to deliver a mixed-use development of Leisure, retail, workspace, food & drink, public realm, car parking and holiday accommodation.

2.6 The Committee supports the following in furtherance of delivering 2.5 above.

- a. That the Council undertake soft market testing to determine the commercial appetite to deliver a scheme similar to that illustrated in the vision document.
- b. That public consultation on the proposed project be undertaken.
- c. That the details of a preferred scheme be developed further to support the preparation of a further report regarding the options for the potential delivery of the agreed vision.

d. That the cost of undertaking the work listed in (a), (b) and (c) above, including the funding of a project officer be drawn from funding allocated from the West Sussex Business Rate Pool to the Arun Growth Deal (subject to the agreement of West Sussex County Council as a co-signatory to the Arun Growth Deal).

e. That the Committee delegate to the Director of Growth authority to draw down the funding identified above and commission any external work necessary to deliver the above in accordance with the Councils rules on procurement.

f. Soft market testing be carried out in relation to this proposal with some flexibility accepted in relation to its size

85. OUTSIDE BODIES UPDATE

There were no updates presented at the meeting.

86. WORK PROGRAMME

The Work Programme for 2024-25 was noted by Members.

87. EXEMPT INFORMATION

The recommendation was proposed by Councillor Lury and seconded by Councillor Woodman.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That under Section 100a (4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public and accredited representatives of newspapers be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 3 of Schedule 12A of the Act by virtue of the paragraph specified against the item.

88. OLD COASTGUARD TOWER LEASE VARIATION

The Senior Estates Surveyor presented the report to members.

The recommendations were proposed by Councillor Woodman and seconded by Councillor Northeast.

Economy Committee - 8.07.24

Members then took part in a debate where a number of questions were asked, full answers were provided by the officer and Interim CEO and Director of Growth.

The Committee

RESOLVED

2.1. To grant authority for the Council to enter into a surrender of the existing Old Coastguard Tower lease at the Promenade, Littlehampton whether by express surrender or variation of the existing lease with the existing tenant.

2.2. To delegate authority to the Group Head of Technical Services to grant a new lease of the Old Coastguard Tower at the Promenade Littlehampton to the existing tenant on the same terms as the original lease dated 10 October 2012 (as varied on 16 November 2023) aside from an altered demise regarding the swap of an external area for the location of a bin and bike store and general modernisation to facilitate the delivery of the Littlehampton Sea front project, whether by express grant or variation of the existing lease.

2.3. To agree to pay the tenant's reasonable legal and surveying fees that can be met from within existing project budgets

89. WINDMILL PH 'HARVESTER' LEASE VARIATION

The Senior Estates Surveyor presented the report to members.

The recommendations were proposed by Councillor Nash and seconded by Councillor Northeast.

Clarification was sought in relation to surrendering the lease on the whole site, the officer provided a full answer to the question asked.

The Committee

RESOLVED

2.1. To grant authority for the Council to enter into a surrender of the existing lease of the Harvester restaurant site dated 5 January 2000, at Windmill Road, Littlehampton, whether by express surrender or variation, with the existing tenant.

2.2. To delegate authority to the Group Head of Technical Services to grant a new lease of land to the east of Windmill Road, Littlehampton to the existing tenant of the Harvester site on the same terms as the original lease dated 5 January 2000, aside from an altered demise regarding the

Subject to approval at the next Economy Committee meeting

59

Economy Committee - 8.07.24

swap of car parking spaces, an altered right of way and general modernisation to facilitate the delivery of the Littlehampton Sea Front project, whether by express grant or variation of the existing lease.

(The meeting concluded at 8.02 pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

Arun District Council

REPORT TO:	Special Economy Committee – 12 September 2024
SUBJECT:	Coastal Catalyst – Place Partnership Fund
LEAD OFFICER:	Nat Slade, Group Head of Technical Services
LEAD MEMBER:	Councillor Nash, Economy Committee Chair
WARDS:	All
CORPORATE PRIORITY / POLICY CONTEXT / CORPORATE VISION:	
<p>Fulfilling Arun’s economic potential</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase opportunities for more high-quality, well-paid employment, encouraging more people to live, work, study and visit Arun. • Use regeneration opportunities to attract new and relocating businesses to the district. • Encourage the development of the district as a key tourist destination, supporting and enabling improvements and activities to increase visitor spend. • Make best use of our natural assets to help drive the economy. <p>Furthering corporate objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating the conditions that will support high tech businesses including the creative digital sector and green businesses, reducing the need for the workforce to commute out of the district. • Working with partners to support a district-wide skills audit, to understand what businesses need and what skills we have in the community. Work with local colleges and the University of Chichester to assist them to run courses that will match local skill needs for those at all stages in their working life. 	
DIRECTORATE POLICY CONTEXT:	
<p>The Council’s Economic Development Strategy includes the following ‘Building Blocks’ and priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shaping our places for people to live, work and visit. • Attracting investment and success giving businesses the space and support to grow and prosper. • Putting people centre stage: healthy, happy, prosperous lives. • Growing business population. 	
FINANCIAL SUMMARY:	
<p>There is no financial commitment or funding contribution from Arun District Council within the project. There is also no financial gain to the authority.</p>	

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To advise the committee of the Coastal Catalyst Place Partnership Fund (Funded by Arts Council, England) awarded project and to seek Committee's support for the inclusion of the Arun District in the scheme.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That the committee supports Arun District's inclusion in the funded project.

3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 3.1 Coastal Catalyst is a project led by Peter Chivers at Future Creators (Part of Brighton Dome and Festivals Limited). They have been successful in being awarded £900,000 by Arts Council, England to deliver youth-based project work.
- 3.2 Arun is a 'levelling up for culture place' area and is included in the bid, at no cost to the authority. Proposed interventions will primarily be in the towns of Bognor Regis and Littlehampton with a view to supporting and including other areas of the district. The committee paper seeks approval from the committee to pursue this.

4. DETAIL

- 4.1 Place Partnership Fund is awarded via the Arts Council, England. The fund (PPF) is designed to support specific types of projects that aim to make a step change in the cultural and creative opportunity in places through the Place Partnership Strand within Project Grants. These are projects that seek to transform an aspect of cultural or creative provision in line with Let's Create (Arts Council, England strategy) and the strategic cultural development aspirations of the place the activity benefits.
- 4.2 The type of change Arts Council, England wish to see is projects that necessitate partnership working. Arts Council England are especially interested in projects that create opportunities for children and young people to experience and engage with cultural and creative activity.
- 4.3 Brighton Dome & Festival Limited have been successful in being awarded £900,000 of funding to work within several local authority areas along the coast of West and East Sussex. This is being managed by Future Creators (as part of Brighton Dome & Festival Limited) and Talent Accelerator, being overseen by a dedicated programme manager. There is also funding from Brighton Dome, Brighton Festival, De La Warr Pavilion and University of Brighton. Bringing the total value to around £1.1million. The bid covers local authority areas including Arun, Bexhill, Brighton, and Hove (East), Eastbourne and Newhaven. These areas fall within the levelling up for culture places. The funding was granted in May 2024 and must be spent by the end of March 2026.
- 4.4 Existing delivery partners included in the bid are as follows:

- Artswork (National Portfolio Organisation – operating in Bognor Regis and Littlehampton)
- Arun District Council
- Audio Active (National Portfolio Organisation – operating in Bognor Regis and Littlehampton)
- Badge Nation
- Brighton & Hove City Council
- Chichester College Group
- Create Music
- Creative Newhaven
- Culture East Sussex
- Cultureshift
- De La Warr Pavilion
- Department of Work and Pensions
- East Brighton Trust
- East Sussex College
- East Sussex County Council
- Enterprise Adviser Network
- Good Space, Make Good Trouble
- Sussex Chamber of Commerce
- Sussex Learning Network
- The Maker Space/Making Theatre
- The Royal Society of the Arts
- University of Brighton
- West Sussex County Council

4.5 The project is focused on investing in infrastructure to support development of new talent, locally based professionals, and expertise as well as new audiences and culturally engaged citizens. This is vital for the sector locally and will create more opportunities for young people aged 14 - 25 to learn the skills needed to fill tangible employment gaps, leading to the growth of the creative/digital economy. The programme will utilise digital badges to provide a permanent digital record of learning and recognition of their non-academic accomplishments.

4.6 Coastal Catalyst will strengthen and grow existing infrastructure through two key work strands: Creative Skills Infrastructure and Research & Development. The programme will also facilitate the establishment of 3 new Creativity Hubs (in Arun, Eastbourne/Newhaven and Bexhill) and a satellite hub in East Brighton.

- 4.7 Arun is one of the 109 (outside of London) 'Levelling Up for Culture Place' local authority areas, identified by the previous government until 2026. These areas are a focus for additional investment and engagement. Arun has a dedicated Relationship Manager to the Arts Council, England where numerous meetings and discussions have already taken place.
- 4.8 Arun District Council has previously submitted a Place Partnership Fund bid but was not successful. By being a delivery partner in a wider bid, this provides further investment to the area and grows our funding profile, as well as our role within promoting the creative industries and sector within the Arts Council, England.
- 4.9 The authority has been engaged with the project since its inception and have had regular dialogue with Future Creators. A letter of support from Arun District Council was also provided as part of their application, with officers facilitating meetings with relevant local partners. An officer from Arun will sit on the 'mobilisation board' with the initial kick off meeting scheduled for September 2024.

5. CONSULTATION

- 5.1 Initial meetings with local partners have taken place, with organisations operating in Bognor Regis and Littlehampton including both Audio Active and Artswork, who are National Portfolio Organisations (subsidised by Arts Council, England). This also includes local educational providers at Further and Higher Education operating in Arun. Further meetings will be planned with stakeholders, to implement the bid, once the programme manager is in place.

6. OPTIONS / ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

- 6.1 The alternative to the recommended option is to decide not to support the Coastal Catalyst project.

7. COMMENTS BY THE GROUP HEAD OF FINANCE/SECTION 151 OFFICER

- 7.1 The funding has been awarded to an external body who wishes to spend the funds along the South Coast of which Arun is one of the locations. There is no funding or financial commitment required from Arun District Council. Any involvement from council officers is minimal which will be met from existing resources and existing budget.

8. RISK ASSESSMENT CONSIDERATIONS

- 8.1 There is no financial risk to the authority. The project is fully funded, the risks sit with Brighton Dome and Festivals Limited who have accepted the funding and are responsible for delivery.

9. COMMENTS OF THE GROUP HEAD OF LAW AND GOVERNANCE & MONITORING OFFICER

9.1 Legal Services will be closely involved and will be advising on the use of the emerging agreements, grant terms or framework. There are no other legal or governance implications at this stage.

10. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT

10.1 Officers have a facilitator role which will include attending occasional meetings with partners which can be undertaken within existing resources.

11. HEALTH & SAFETY IMPACT

11.1 No direct health and safety impacts identified in relation to the proposals in this report.

12. PROPERTY & ESTATES IMPACT

12.1 None

13. EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA) / SOCIAL VALUE

13.1 None

14. CLIMATE CHANGE & ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT/SOCIAL VALUE

14.1 None

15. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPACT

15.1 None

16. HUMAN RIGHTS IMPACT

16.1 None

17. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION / DATA PROTECTION CONSIDERATIONS

17.1 None

CONTACT OFFICER:

Name: Matt Gover

Job Title: Economic Regeneration Projects Officer

Contact Number: 07385 412134

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

[Arts Council, England 'Let's create' strategy](#)

[Place Partnership Fund](#)

[Arun Economic Strategy](#)

Arun District Council

REPORT TO:	Special Economy Committee – 12 September 2024
SUBJECT:	Beach Hut Lease Terms – Beach Access Considerations
LEAD OFFICER:	Karl Roberts, Director of Growth
LEAD MEMBER:	Cllr. Roger Nash, Chair of Economy Committee
WARDS:	Beach, Felpham West
CORPORATE PRIORITY / POLICY CONTEXT / CORPORATE VISION:	
<p>The continuation of rental beach hut lettings in the manner recommended by this report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) will support the Council’s Vision in respect of fulfilling Arun’s economic potential. <i>“Encouraging the development of the district as a key tourist destination, supporting and enabling improvements and activities to increase visitor spend.”</i> b) accords with the principals of the Council’s 2024-28 Financial Strategy. 	
DIRECTORATE POLICY CONTEXT:	
This report is presented within the context of the Council’s Asset Management Strategy.	
FINANCIAL SUMMARY:	
<p>The 92 rental beach huts across the district currently generate £112k per annum (subject to occasional short void periods).</p> <p>Recommendation 2.1.1a) presented in this report are estimated to generate £149k in the 2025/26 financial year, with further RPI increases each year. A total estimated income of £462k over the recommended three-year contractual term (assuming RPI at 3%), representing a total increase of £126k to Council revenue streams over the current position. These figures may increase further if rental beach hut leaseholders opt in to the opportunity to share occupation.</p> <p>Recommendation 2.1.1b) presented in this report are estimated to generate £153k in the 2025/26 financial year, with further RPI increases each year. A total estimated income of £473k over the recommended three-year contractual term (assuming RPI at 3%), representing a total increase of £137k to Council revenue streams over the current position. These figures may also increase further if rental beach hut leaseholders opt in to the opportunity to share occupation. A revenue budget of £8k (year 1) would then be created, resulting in a net income of £145k in the first year.</p>	

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1. This report follows from the Beach Hut Lease Terms report which was presented to Economy Committee on 8 July, and responds to questions raised by members regarding beach access solutions and the allocation of beach hut income towards such a scheme.
- 1.2. This report also explores options for lease mechanisms to permit subletting or sharing of occupation and responds to proposals for further rent increases to non-resident leaseholders.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1. That the Economy Committee delegates authority to the Group Head of Technical Services to:

2.1.1.

a) Offer and grant the 92 existing and 13 additional rental beach huts for lease on like terms as the existing agreements, save as to the following:-

Contractual Term	A term of three years commencing on 1 st April 2025 and expiring on 31 st March 2028
Annual Rent Arun District Resident	An initial annual rent of £1,396.26 (excl. VAT) which includes a 16.5% increase on 24/25 annual rent, to increase annually by RPI.
Annual Rent non-Arun District Resident	An initial annual rent of £1,675.50 (excl. VAT) which includes a 16.5% increase on 24/25 annual rent, to increase annually by RPI.

First by renewal to existing tenants, and second to Arun District residents only from the appropriate waiting list, and thereafter to Arun District residents only by appropriate marketing strategy.

Or, to enable a contribution towards beach access to be made:-

b) Offer and grant the 92 existing and 13 additional rental beach huts for lease on like terms as the existing agreements, save as to the following:-

Contractual Term	A term of three years commencing on 1 st April 2025 and expiring on 31 st March 2028
Annual Rent Arun District Resident	An initial annual rent of £1,437.66 (excl. VAT) which includes a 20% increase on 24/25 annual rent, to increase annually by RPI.
Annual Rent non-Arun District Resident	An initial annual rent of £1,725.18 (excl. VAT) which includes a 20% increase on 24/25 annual rent, to increase annually by RPI.

First by renewal to existing tenants, and second to Arun District residents only from the appropriate waiting list, and thereafter to Arun District residents only by appropriate marketing strategy.

And that a budget then be established representing 5% of the expected annual income from rental beach huts for the proposed 3 year term, for use towards the agreed beach access objectives (4.3) at both Littlehampton and Bognor Regis.

- 2.1.2. Include an option within the rental beach hut leases allowing tenants to share occupation at an increased rent of +20% above the rents stated in 2.1.1.
- 2.2. That the Economy Committee recommends to the Environment Committee that the principles and agreed objectives (4.3) established by the Bognor Regis Beach Access Working Party be applied additionally to Littlehampton Beach.
- 2.3. That officers survey existing beach hut leaseholders and waiting list customers to better understand any interest in future opportunities for sharing of occupation in relation to beach hut leases and the income that may generate for the Council, reporting back to this committee no later than Q1 2026.

3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 3.1. This report follows from the Beach Hut Lease Terms report which was presented to Economy Committee on 8 July, and responds to questions raised by members regarding beach access solutions and the allocation of beach hut income towards such a scheme.

4. DETAIL

Beach Access

- 4.1. On 8 July the Economy Committee considered a report which recommended terms for renewal of the Council’s rental beach hut leases. The committee deferred the matter, requesting Officers to consider how beach hut income could support a beach access scheme.
- 4.2. The subject of beach access has been considered extensively by the Environment Committee (and Cabinet), most recently on 21 November 2023 at minute 385. In November 2021 the Environment Committee resolved to establish the Bognor Regis Beach Access Working Party (BRBAWP) on a “task and finish” basis, the outcomes of which were reported to the Environment Committee in February 2023 stating that *“similar principles of the outcome of this work can be applied to access to all Arun’s beaches”*.
- 4.3. The Environment Committee agreed the following objectives:

1	Establish and engage with a user / stakeholder group for ongoing dialogue.
2	Apply the latest national guidance for equality of access to the natural environment.
3	Establish a vision statement and clear project critical success factors / objectives such as “what does success look like”?

4	Review seafront amenities and access in conjunction with the solution, such as disabled parking, toilet and changing facilities.
5	Utilise existing assets where possible coupled with a combination of smaller interventions for 'least restrictive access'.

4.4. In November 2023 an update was provided to the Environment Committee on this work, including assessment of existing ramp facilities at Bognor Regis, and specific feedback from Worthing Borough Council following a trial of wheeled beach access aids. The report invited any proposals for potential funding streams to aid this ongoing work. Funding has been a challenge and barrier to the ambitions of this work.

4.5. It is not possible at this stage to provide specific proposals as to how exactly any income from beach huts may be utilised towards the agreed objectives, the specifics should be determined by the ongoing work of the Environment Committee.

4.6. At the July meeting of the Economy Committee, it was suggested that an additional percentage of beach hut income could be provided towards this objective. An option reflecting this is provided within the recommendations of this report.

4.7. Example percentages of the total projected year 1 (2025) income of £153k from rental beach huts are as follows:

3.5%	5%	10%
£5,355	£7,650	£15,300

4.8. Feedback from the Council's Coastal and Flood Engineering Manager indicates that 5% would provide a meaningful contribution towards the current beach access objectives, funding works such as shingle clearance of existing assets and improvements to the access chain.

Sharing Occupation

4.9. During the meeting on 8 July, members also asked that an option for rental beach hut leaseholders to "sublet" be considered.

4.10. An option for subletting was included when Committee previously considered beach hut leases in 2021 and was offered to tenants for their existing lease term which commenced in April 2022. This option was offered for an increased rent 25% over the base rent.

4.11. It is important to outline at this stage the distinct difference between subletting and sharing occupation: subletting is a formal legal transaction which requires the drafting of a sublease transferring possession to the sublessee (all of such work to be conducted by the tenant, not the Council), whereas sharing of occupation allows the demise to be used by others but specifically prohibits the creation of any landlord/tenant relationship providing a more flexible alternative.

- 4.12. In considering this, Officers are of the view that the intention of Committee Members is to permit rental beach hut leaseholders to share occupation thus allowing for occasional use by others and Airbnb style bookable hire.
- 4.13. The option offered in 2021 for permitting subletting was not opted into by any rental beach hut leaseholders. The additional 25% rent charge would require a minimum of 7 bookings per year at £55 per day (less commission) to break even.
- 4.14. A suggestion made by a member of the Economy Committee was that Arun District Council could host an AirBnB style booking service where beach hut leaseholders could list their hut for daily hire, with the Council taking a commission from each booking. Officers have explored this proposal and set out two options for delivery below:
- 4.14.1. To develop a hosting service similar to <https://www.beachhuts.com/> or <https://www.beachhuts4hire.co.uk/> including self-serving leaseholder portal with ID verification:- While technically possible, this is a significant piece of work for the Council's ICT Development team, estimated to require 5 officers committed full time for 5-6 months to undertake design, build, and testing (not including artistic web design). The Council's ICT Development team are currently committed on major projects until April 2026.
- 4.14.2. To develop a basic process with ICT back-office forms, back-office booking calendar, and payment handling:- This option would not allow leaseholders to self-serve, and would require officers to administer the availability of huts, and to take enquiries by phone to make bookings on behalf of leaseholders and customers. Development time for this solution may only take a number of days subject to project scoping, and may be deliverable ahead of April 2026 between existing project commitments. The staff resource implications for administering bookings cannot be absorbed within the Property, Estates, and Facilities team. Customer Services may be able to handle calls and enquiries for booking, but this would need to be scoped and any resource costs covered (not currently budgeted).
- 4.15. It is expected that bookings would be paid for by card. All card payments received by the Council are subject to administrative fees and commissions levied by the provider. These fees are variable dependant on the card used and the value of the transaction. Using an example transaction of £55, an estimated average fee of £2 per transaction should be allowed for.
- 4.16. Arun District Council would have to account for VAT at the standard rate on any retained commission.
- 4.17. Worked examples of a booking are appended to this report.

- 4.18. Arun District Council would not be able to insist that beach hut leaseholders used its own booking platform, and any attempt to do so would likely be in breach of competition law. The Council would therefore be operating in competition with the likes of <https://www.beachhuts.com/> or <https://www.beachhuts4hire.co.uk/>.
- 4.19. Sharing of occupation through day-hire schemes or similar would not affect the Non-Domestic Rates status for rental beach hut leaseholders.
- 4.20. Sharing of occupation through day-hire schemes or similar would not affect the Council's buildings insurance policy or premium for beach huts, but potentially increases the likelihood of an insurable event occurring and the Council then having to manage reinstatement. The Council's excess for any claim in respect of damage to beach huts is £1,000.
- 4.21. Any lease clause consenting to a rental beach hut leaseholder sharing occupation where they are effectively operating it as a hire out business will require that the lease is drawn on a commercial basis and the Council must therefore contract any affected leases out of the security of tenure provisions of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1954.
- 4.22. It is not known why rental beach hut leaseholders did not opt into the subletting option previously offered. The additional 25% rent increase may be prohibitive, or there may simply be no interest. It is also unknown if there would be any interest in using a platform developed by the Council for listing huts for daily hire.
- 4.23. To establish the true interest in any option to share occupation and the opportunity this may provide for increasing Council revenue generation, it is recommended at 2.4 that officers survey existing beach hut leaseholders and waiting list customers, reporting back to committee no later than Q1 2026.
- 4.24. While this is resolved, it is recommended at 2.1.2 to offer the option of sharing occupation to rental beach hut leaseholders at a rent increased by 20%. This figure is slightly below the previous offer of 25% which will hopefully encourage a little more uptake while market research is undertaken.

Non-resident Rent Increases

- 4.25. During the meeting on 8 July, members discussed the potential for higher rental increases to non-resident leaseholders.
- 4.26. The report presented to members on 8 July recommended maintaining a higher rent charge to non-residents. The recommended rent to be charged to non-resident leaseholders is uplifted to £1,675.50 per annum and represents an additional 20% (£279.24) over the recommended rent charged to resident leaseholders. This rental increase of 20% follows the principle previously set and agreed by committee.

- 4.27. There are currently 7 rental beach hut tenants from outside of the District. The rents recommended in the report presented on 8 July would generate a total of £2,233.92 per annum above that generated by the equivalent number of rental beach hut tenants from within the District.
- 4.28. An additional 20% rent charge is established. Any increase on this additional charge may cause non-resident leaseholders to not renew their lease.
- 4.29. Again, following previously established principles, the recommendation presented to Committee on 8 July sets out that any new leaseholders must be resident of the Arun District. Therefore, each time a non-resident tenant chooses not to renew their lease or exercises a break clause the Council will lose £279.24 per annum.
- 4.30. If the rent charged to non-resident leaseholders is increased further there is an increased risk that these leaseholders will not renew their lease and the Council will therefore not benefit from this additional income. It is therefore not recommended to increase rents to non-resident leaseholders above the established 20% uplift.

Arithmetical Correction

- 4.31. Due to an administrative error, the previous report to members stated the passing rent as £1,214.14 for residents of the Arun District, and £1,456.96 for non-residents. This was incorrect. The passing rent for residents of the Arun District stands at £1,198.05, and £1,437.65 for non-residents.
- 4.32. The previously proposed rents remain unchanged as these are based upon the market appraisal undertaken by officers. However, in percentage terms the uplift represents 16.5%, the recommendations of this report have been corrected to reflect this.

5. CONSULTATION

- 5.1. Ward members of Beach and Felpham West have been notified directly of this work program item, and no responses have yet been received.
- 5.2. Due to the wider impact of the options and recommendations presented by this report, additional internal consultation has been undertaken.

Coastal and Flood Engineers

- 5.3. The Council's Coastal and Flood Engineering Manager has been consulted in consideration of the ongoing beach access work and its application to Littlehampton beach.

Revenues

- 5.4. The Revenues team have been consulted in consideration of non-domestic rates implications where sharing of occupation has been considered (see 4.19).

Finance and Risk

- 5.5. The Council's Finance and Risk Manager has been consulted in respect of VAT and insurance implications relating to sharing of occupation and hosting a day hire booking service (see 4.15, 4.16, 4.17, 4.20).

ICT Development

- 5.6. The Council's ICT Development team have been consulted on the implications and practicalities of developing a day hire booking platform (see 4.14.1 and 4.14.2).

6. OPTIONS / ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

- 6.1. The options set out at this section of this report are in addition to those already described under section 6 of the previous report on this subject.
- 6.2. To increase rents above the recommended figures – This option is not recommended. A detailed market appraisal has been undertaken and rents proposed appropriately.
- 6.3. To apply a higher rent increase to non-resident leaseholders – This option is not recommended. With only 7 non-resident leaseholders the benefit of applying further rent increases to this small group will be minimal and may cause these leaseholders not to renew their leases.
- 6.4. To develop and implement a day hire booking platform for rental beach hut leaseholders to list their huts:- This option is not recommended without further market research and scoping, which it is not possible to complete before preparing these lease renewals.

7. COMMENTS BY THE GROUP HEAD OF FINANCE/SECTION 151 OFFICER

- 7.1. The recommendation 2.1.1a sees a prudent approach that protects the Council and leaseholder from volatile inflation. The hourly rental proposals will require financial reviews of the Terms and Conditions to ensure we approximately mitigate financial risks.

8. RISK ASSESSMENT CONSIDERATIONS

- 8.1. It may be that making funds available in recommendation 2.1.1b provides only limited improvements to beach accessibility.
- 8.2. Renewing such a large batch of leases simultaneously is resource intensive, and there is a risk that lease renewals are delayed and not completed by 1 April 2025.
- 8.3. Raising rents may generate a greater rate of turnover, impacting service resource in identifying new tenants and preparing new leases.

8.4. Beach huts are located in positions vulnerable to storm damage, particularly those placed on the shingle. There is a risk that huts may suffer damage and the Council incurs costs for their repair or replacement. Beach huts are covered by the Council's buildings insurance policy.

9. COMMENTS OF THE GROUP HEAD OF LAW AND GOVERNANCE & MONITORING OFFICER

9.1. The beach huts are all located on areas of public open space. Consequently, the disposals should all be advertised in accordance with Section 123 of the Local Government Act 1972 with any objections thereafter considered before the leases are entered into. In addition, if sharing occupation is allowed and this allows the tenant to charge for such use then this risks the tenancy becoming a business tenancy under the Landlord and Tenant Act 1954. As such, the safest option to prevent security of tenure on lease expiry would be to contract leases allowing this use out of the security of tenure provisions of sections 24-28 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1954.'

10. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT

10.1. Management of ground lease and rental agreements for beach huts is generally resource intensive. The range of options for lease formats and rent scales resulting from the resolution of the October 2021 Economy Committee meeting have been challenging to administer. Now in the final year of the rental agreements with all tenants on equal rent the management of rental beach huts is far simpler.

10.2. No additional resource will be required. However, the task of transacting on a batch of 92 leases all on the same date should not be underestimated.

11. HEALTH & SAFETY IMPACT

11.1. There will be no direct health and safety impact as a result of actioning the recommendations of this report.

12. PROPERTY & ESTATES IMPACT

12.1. The task of issuing new leases will be delivered jointly by the Property, Estates, and Facilities and Legal Services teams.

12.2. Ongoing management of the beach huts subject to this report will be carried out by the Property, Estates, and Facilities service.

13. EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA) / SOCIAL VALUE

13.1. The equalities impact assessment has not identified adverse impacts on protected characteristics arising out of the recommended lease terms. If recommendation 2.1.1b is agreed, it makes available funds to apply the beach access principles to Littlehampton Beach which may assist those with limited mobility access the lower beach.

14. CLIMATE CHANGE & ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT/SOCIAL VALUE

14.1. As this report is focusing solely on beach hut lease terms there is no direct impact on climate change or emissions in relation to the Council's scope 1, 2 and 3 sources as a result of these recommendations.

15. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPACT

15.1. There are no direct implications in relation to crime and disorder by way of this report.

16. HUMAN RIGHTS IMPACT

16.1. There will be no direct human rights impacts from the recommendations.

17. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION / DATA PROTECTION CONSIDERATIONS

17.1. The content of this report has no freedom of information or data protection implications.

CONTACT OFFICER:

Name: Sam Horwill

Job Title: Property, Estates & Facilities Manager

Contact Number: 01903 737516

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

[Beach Hut Lease Terms - Economy 8 July 2024](#)

[Beach Access For All Update - Environment 21 November 2023](#)

[Rental Beach Hut Day Hire Worked Examples](#)

[EIA](#)

REPRESENTATION ON OUTSIDE BODIES – 2024-25
As at August 2024

NO	BODY	CURRENT REP	TERM OF OFFICE	RELEVANT COMMITTEE	RELEVANT LEAD OFFICER
1	Littlehampton Harbour Board	Cllr Bicknell, Haywood and Walsh. Roger Spencer [already appointed – 17 March 2021]	4 year until 31 March 2025	Environment	Philippa Dart
1a	Littlehampton Harbour Board – Advisory Group	Butcher	19 May 21 – to May 2025	Environment	Philippa Dart
4	Court of the University of Sussex	Penycate	1 yr–to 31 July 2025	Policy & Finance	Chief Executive
5	Action in Rural Sussex	Nash	1 yr - to Oct 2025	Economy	Karl Roberts
6	South-East Employers	Oppler and Warr (sub) Nash (sub) Lawrence	1 yr - to July 2025	Corporate Support	Jackie Follis
7	Tourism South East Sussex	Stanley	1 yr - to May 2025	Economy	Miriam Nicholls
9	South Downs National Park Authority	McAuliffe	4 yrs – May 2019 to May 2027	Planning Policy	Neil Crowther
10	Conservation Area Advisory Committee	Yeates and Lury (sub) Huntley (sub) McAuliffe	1 yr - to May 2025	Planning Policy	Neil Crowther
11	Keystone Centre Management Committee	Northeast	1 yr - to May 2025	Housing & Wellbeing	Philippa Dart
12	St Mary's Community Centre, Felpham – Management Committee	Stainton	1 yr - to May 2025	Corporate Support	Antony Baden
13	Bognor Regis Regeneration Board and Bognor Regis Regeneration Steering Group	Stanley	1 yr - to May 2025	Economy	Miriam Nicholls
14	Arun Wellbeing and Health Partnership	Birch and May	1 yr - to May 2025	Housing & Wellbeing	Philippa Dart
15	West Sussex Health and Adult Social Care Committee	Long	1 yr – to May 2025	Housing & Wellbeing	Philippa Dart
16	LGA's Coastal Issues Special Interest Group – [Appointment made by the LGA]	Wiltshire	1yr to Sep 2025	Environment	Nat Slade

Page 31

REPRESENTATION ON OUTSIDE BODIES – 2024-25
As at August 2024

20	Police and Crime Panel	Birch Sub - Butcher	1 yr – to May 2025	Housing & Wellbeing	Philippa Dart
22	Safer Arun Partnership	Butcher Sub Cooper [Alison]	1 yr to May 2025	Housing & Wellbeing	Philippa Dart
23	Coastal West Sussex and Greater Brighton Strategic Planning Board	Yeates	1 yr to May 2025	Planning Policy	Karl Roberts
26	West Sussex Fire & Rescue Services Inter Authority Fire & Rescue Liaison Group	Yeates	t.b.c.	Housing & Wellbeing	Philippa Dart
28	Arun Hub Partnership Board [formally known as Integrated Prevention and Earliest Help (IPEH) Board]	Birch	1 year to May 2025	Residential and Wellbeing Services	Philippa Dart
30	Greater Brighton Economic Board	Leader of the Council – Sub: Deputy Leader –	1 year to May 2025	Policy & Finance	Miriam Nicholls
31	Inter Authority Air Quality Group	Worne [Amanda]	1 year to May 2025	Environment	Nat Slade
32	South East Coastal Group Monitoring Meeting	This is an Officer Group to which the Councillor appointed is invited to attend once per year Wallsgrove	1 year to May 2025	Environment	Nat Slade
33	A27 Arundel Improvements Consultation Group NOTE: This group was disbanded and reformed at Council on 17 March 2021	Leader of the Council plus 3 other Cllrs – Birch McAuliffe Wallsgrove	March 2021 to TBC	Policy & Finance – as a major partnership function	Jackie Follis
34	Angmering Advisory Group	All Ward Members – Bicknell Cooper [Andy] - Chair Worne [Amelia]	1 year to May 2024	Planning Policy	Neil Crowther
35	North Littlehampton Advisory Group	May Northeast [Chair] Tandy	1 year to May 2024	Planning Policy	Neil Crowther
36	Yapton, Ford & Clymping Advisory Group	All Ward Members Jones - Chair Worne [Amanda]	1 year to May 2024	Planning Policy	Neil Crowther

REPRESENTATION ON OUTSIDE BODIES – 2024-25
As at August 2024

37	Barnham, Eastergate and Westergate Advisory Group (BEWAG)	All Ward Members Ayling Lawrence Wallsgrove - Chair	1 year to May 2024	Planning Policy	Neil Crowther
38	Aldwick West & Pagham Advisory Group	Hamilton [Chair] Huntley Needs Purser	1 year to May 2024	Planning Policy	Neil Crowther
39	West Bersted Advisory Group	All Ward Members Greenway Lury Yeates - Chair	1 year to May 2024	Planning Policy	Neil Crowther
40	Civil Military Engagement Events Group and Military Champion for Arun District Council [through WSCC]	Turner	1 year to May 2024	Housing & Wellbeing	Philippa Dart
41	WSCC – Joint Climate Board	Wiltshire	1 year to May 2024	Policy & Finance	Philippa Dart
42	Arun Integrated Prevention & Earliest Help [IPEH] Hub Partnership Advisory Board	Birch	1 year to May 2024	Housing & Wellbeing	Joy Bradbury Ball
43	Parking and Traffic Regulations Outside London Adjudication Joint Committee	Warr	1 year to May 2024	Environment	Nat Slade/Lisa Emmens
44	Arun UK Shared Prosperity Fund – Partnership Group	Leader of the Council Deputy Leader of the Council	1 year to May 2024	Policy & Finance	Matt Gover
45	Bathing Water Quality Steering Group	Brooks Amanda Worne	1 year to May 2024	Environment	Joe Russell-Wells
46	East Arun Health Services Advisory Committee	Northeast Sub- Walsh	1 year to May 2025	Housing & Wellbeing	Philippa Dart
47	Southern Water Local Authority Stakeholder Group	Wallsgrove	1 Year to May 2025	Environment	Karl Roberts
48	Voluntary Action Arun and Chichester	Yeates	1 year to May 2025	Housing & Wellbeing	Philippa Dart
49	Littlehampton Town Centre Action Group	Woodman [Vice-Chair of Economy] Wiltshire [River Ward Member]	1 year to May 2025	Economy	Miriam Nicholls
50	Sussex Bay	Wallsgrove	1 year to May 2025	Environment	Karl Roberts

This page is intentionally left blank

ECONOMY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2024-2025

Economy Committee	Report Author	Public consultation prior to Committee Meeting (Y/N)	Date of Meeting	Full Council Meeting Date
Karl Roberts, Nat Slade, Denise Vine, Anthony Baden, Jackie Follis				
Regis Quarter (working title) Feasibility Study & Incorporating the Former Brewers Fayre Site	M Whitehand		8 July 24	17.7.24
Beach Hut Lease Terms	S Horwill	No		
Windmill PH Harvester Lease Variation	I Hazle	No		
Old Coastguard Tower Lease Variation	I Hazle	No		
Corporate Gas Supply Contract 2025-2029	N Slade	No		
Q4 KPI Report	J Follis	No		
Council Vision Performance Report 2023-24	J Follis	No		
Coastal Catalyst, Place Partnership Fund Bid	N Slade/M Gover	No	SPECIAL 12 Sept 24	7.11.24
Beach Hut Lease Terms – Beach Access Considerations	S Horwill	No		
Economy Project Update	M Nicholls	No	22 Oct 24	7.11.24
Waterloo Square Options - Update	S Horwill	No		
Additional Beach Hut Consultations	S Horwill	No		
Asset Review	S Horwill	No		
Update report on Bognor Regis Creative Vision	N Slade/M Gover	No		
Bognor Regis Arcade Project Update	M Whitehand	No		
Budget Process Report	A Baden	No		
	A Baden			

ECONOMY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2024-2025

Economy Committee	Report Author	Public consultation prior to Committee Meeting (Y/N)	Date of Meeting	Full Council Meeting Date
Karl Roberts, Nat Slade, Denise Vine, Anthony Baden, Jackie Follis				
Budget Monitoring Report Q1	S Horwill	No		
Corporate Cleaning Contract		No		
Changing Places Toilet Project Review	H Cooper	No	23 Jan 25	26.2.25 (Special Budget)
River Road Garage Site Options	S Horwill	No		19.3.25
Solar Photovoltaic Panel Installation and Fitzleet Multistorey Car Park	S Horwill	No		
Asset Management Strategy	S Horwill	No		
Littlehampton Town Centre Action Group Update	M Nicholls	No		
Committee Revenue and Capital Budgets 2025/26	A Baden	No		
Budget Monitoring Report to 31 Dec 2024	A Baden	No		
Bognor Regis Café Business Cases	S Horwill	No		
Q2 Budget Monitoring Report	A Baden	No	1 April 25	14.5.25